REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

As a preliminary matter, applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to their undersigned representative during a telephone interview held on January 22, 2010. During the interview, the alleged deficiencies of the most recent Amendment, filed September 24, 2009 ("the prior reply"), were discussed. No agreement was reached on the claims, but the nature of the alleged deficiency in the prior reply, and the manner of addressing the alleged deficiency, were discussed.

Claims 1-33 are pending herein, with claims 3-5, 9, 15-23, 25, 26 and 28-33 withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-14, 24 and 27 are under examination, with claim 1 being independent. Claims 1-4 and 8 were amended in the prior reply.

In the pending Notice, the Examiner took the position that the prior reply was deficient because 1) it allegedly failed to discuss the specifics of why claim 12 reads over the prior art, and 2) lacked a specific discussion of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over WO 00/40886 (Baylot) in view of United States Patent No. 5,020,481 (Nelson) and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,703,127 (Davis, *et al.*). While traversing this rejection, as it is believed that the prior reply was fully responsive, applicants supplement the prior reply by stating that the addition of Davis, *et al.* to the primary combination of Baylot and Nelson, et al. overcomes none of the shortcomings of the primary combination as explained in detail in the prior reply. It is further pointed out that Davis, *et al.* was not applied for the purpose of addressing the deficiencies in the primary combination discussed in the prior reply, but rather for addressing the limitations added by claim 12.

For completeness, applicants wish to add that none of the prior art in the record, whether applied by the Examiner to any specific claim or not, fails to teach or suggest the features of the

invention pointed out in the prior reply as distinguishing over the primary combination of Baylot and Nelson.

Thus, it is believed that the above remarks completely address the alleged deficiencies in the prior reply, as explained by the Examiner during the interview, and that the above remarks, taken together with the amendments and remarks contained in the prior reply, completely meet the Examiner's rejections as last stated.

Accordingly, all grounds for objection and rejection having been addressed, and there being no new substantive rejection or objection outstanding, early and favorable action on the merits of the application is respectfully solicited. In the interests of speeding the advancement of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned should there be any further perceived shortfall in the response to the Office Action dated June 24, 2009..

It is believed that no further fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By /Roger S. Thompson/
Roger S. Thompson
Reg. No. 29,594
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: January 27, 2010